



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/730,401 | 12/08/2003 | Sohail Baig Mohammed | MS1-1873US | 2587 |
| 22801 | 7590 | 10/28/2008 | | |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC 601 W Riverside Avenue Suite 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201 | | | EXAMINER PRICE, NATHAN E | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2194 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 10/28/2008 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/730,401 | Applicant(s) MOHAMMED ET AL. | |
| | Examiner NATHAN PRICE | Art Unit 2194 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert L. Villhard (Reg. No. 53,725). (3) ____.

(2) NATHAN PRICE. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 21 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lortz.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendments were discussed. The proposed amendments appear to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112. Possible ways to distinguish the claims from Lortz were discussed. Examiner called Applicant's representative on 23 October 2008 as a follow-up to discuss the prior art. Amendments require further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------|
| | /Meng-Ai An/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195 |
|--|------------------------------------------------------------|